

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT


To: Eric B. Meyertons
Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND
THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION

(PCT Rule 44.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 5838-06705	Date of mailing (day/month/year) 19 NOV 2007
International application No. PCT/US07/61239	International filing date (day/month/year) 29 January 2007
Applicant CHASE MEDICAL, L.P.	

1. ☒ The applicant is hereby notified that the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority have been established and are transmitted herewith.
Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:
 The applicant is entitled, if he so wishes, to amend the claims of the international application (see Rule 46):
When? The time limit for filing such amendments is normally two months from the date of transmittal of the international search report.
Where? Directly to the International Bureau of WIPO, 34 chemin des Colombettes
 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile No.: +41 22 740 14 35
For more detailed instructions, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.
2. ☐ The applicant is hereby notified that no international search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.
3. ☐ With regard to the protest against payment of (an) additional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:
 - ☐ the protest together with the decision thereon has been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the applicant's request to forward the texts of both the protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.
 - ☐ no decision has been made yet on the protest; the applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.
4. **Reminders**
 Shortly after the expiration of **18 months** from the priority date, the international application will be published by the International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or postpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international application, or of the priority claim, must reach the International Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication.
 The applicant may submit comments on an informal basis on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the International Bureau. The International Bureau will send a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an international preliminary examination report has been or is to be established. These comments would also be made available to the public but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.
 Within **19 months** from the priority date, but only in respect of some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone the entry into the national phase until **30 months** from the priority date (in some Offices even later); otherwise, the applicant must, within **20 months** from the priority date, perform the prescribed acts for entry into the national phase before those designated Offices.
 In respect of other designated Offices, the time limit of **30 months** (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19 months.
 See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet site.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. 571-273-3201	Authorized officer:  Blaine R. Copenheaver Telephone No. 571-272-7774
---	--

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 5838-06705	FOR FURTHER ACTION	see Form PCT/ISA/220 as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.
International application No. PCT/US07/61239	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 29 January 2007	(Earliest) Priority Date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 27 January 2006
Applicant CHASE MEDICAL, L.P.		

This international search report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This international search report consists of a total of 3 sheets.

☐ It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

1. Basis of the report

a. With regard to the **language**, the international search was carried out on the basis of:

☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed.

☐ a translation of the international application into _____ which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

b. ☐ This international search report has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43.6bis(a)).

c. ☐ With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, see Box No. I.

2. ☒ **Certain claims were found unsearchable** (see Box No. II).

3. ☐ **Unity of invention is lacking** (see Box No. III).

4. With regard to the **title**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

5. With regard to the **abstract**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this international search report, submit comments to this Authority.

6. With regard to the **drawings**,

a. the figure of the **drawings** to be published with the abstract is Figure No. 62B

☒ as suggested by the applicant.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because this figure better characterizes the invention.

b. ☐ none of the figures is to be published with the abstract.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US07/61239

Box No. II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)

This international search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons:

1. ☐ Claims Nos.:
because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
2. ☐ Claims Nos.:
because they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful international search can be carried out, specifically:
3. ☒ Claims Nos.: 4-21
because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).

Box No. III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)

This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:

1. ☐ As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers all searchable claims.
2. ☐ As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying additional fees, this Authority did not invite payment of additional fees.
3. ☐ As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. ☐ No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this international search report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:

Remark on Protest

- ☐ The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest and, where applicable, the payment of a protest fee.
- ☐ The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid within the time limit specified in the invitation.
- ☐ No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US07/61239

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC(8) - A61B 5/05 (2007.01)

USPC - 600/407

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC(8) - A61B 5/05, 5/055; G01R 33/20; G06K 9/00

USPC - 600/407, 410, 481, 508, 524; 382/128

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)

PatBase

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	US 2004/0153128 A1 (SURESH et al) 05 August 2004 (05.08.2004) entire document	1-3
Y	US 5,803,914 A (RYALS et al) 08 September 1998 (08.09.1998) entire document	1-3
Y	US 2005/0254700 A1 (NAGATA et al) 17 November 2005 (17.11.2005) entire document	1-3
Y	US 2004/0006266 A1 (USTUNER et al) 08 January 2004 (08.01.2004) entire document	1-3

☐ Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.

* Special categories of cited documents:

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

05 October 2007

Date of mailing of the international search report

19 NOV 2007

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US, Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

Authorized officer:

Blaine R. Copenheaver

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300

PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: Eric B. Meyertons
Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **19 NOV 2007**

Applicant's or agent's file reference
5838-06705

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US07/61239

International filing date (day/month/year)
29 January 2007

Priority date (day/month/year)
27 January 2006

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC(8) - A61B 5/05 (2007.01)
USPC - 600/407

Applicant **CHASE MEDICAL, L.P.**

I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

Date of completion of this opinion
05 October 2007

Authorized officer
Blaine Copenheaver

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300
PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US07/61239

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed.
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into _____ which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. ☐ This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
4. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US07/61239

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of

- ☐ the entire international application
☒ claims Nos. 4-21

because: Claims 4-21 are improper multiple dependent claims.

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

- ☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- ☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 4-21

- ☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

- ☐ furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
☐ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rule 13ter.1(a) or (b).

- ☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

- ☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US07/61239

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-3	YES
	Claims	None	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-3	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-3	YES
	Claims	None	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-3 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Suresh et al. (US 2004/0153128) and further in view of Ryals et al. (US 5,803,914), Nagata et al. (US2005/0254700), and Ustuner et al. (US 2004/0006266).

Regarding claim 1, Suresh et al. disclose a method of assessing a state of a human heart, comprising: providing a first set of images of a heart (paragraphs 0019-0021 and claim 1) and a second set of images of a heart (paragraphs 0019-0021 and claim 18); wherein the first and second set of images are taken over a first period of time and a second period of time (paragraphs 0019-0021 and claim 18); dividing the images of the heart from the first and second set into a plurality of regions of the heart for each set (paragraph 0138 and claim 131); assessing at least a first property in each region of the heart (paragraphs 190-198, 204, 207-212); assessing at least a second property in each region of the heart (paragraphs 190-198, 204, 207-212); comparing a first property of a region of the heart to a second property of the region of the heart to assess a third property of the region of the heart (paragraphs 190-198, 204, 207-212). However, Suresh does not disclose each of the regions corresponds between each of the images from the first and second set; redividing the plurality of regions of the heart for the first and second set to produce a resampled first set of regions of the heart and a resampled second set of regions of the heart such that the resampled first set and the resampled second set comprise an equivalent predetermined number of regions of the heart; assessing data from the resampled first set; assessing data from the resampled second set; and comparing data from the resampled first set to data from the resampled second set. However, Ryals et al. teach each of the regions corresponds between each of the images from the first and second set (column 5, lines 50-67). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Suresh et al. to include the method where each of the regions corresponds between each of the images from the first and second set as taught by Ryals et al. for the purpose of comparing data from different regions of the heart.

Moreover, Nagata et al. teach redividing the plurality of regions of data for the first and second set to produce a resampled first set of regions of data and a resampled second set of regions of data such that the resampled first set and the resampled second set comprise an equivalent predetermined number of regions of data (paragraph 0037). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Suresh et al. to include the method of redividing the plurality of regions of data for the first and second set to produce a resampled first set of regions of data and a resampled second set of regions of data such that the resampled first set and the resampled second set comprise an equivalent predetermined number of regions of data as taught by Nagata et al. for the purpose of increasing the resolution of the different regions of data. Further, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply this method to the heart as disclosed by Suresh et al. for the purpose of being able to target different types of tissues.

Moreover, Ustuner teaches assessing data from the resampled first set (paragraphs 0023 and 0030); assessing data from the resampled second set (paragraphs 0023 and 0030); and comparing data from the resampled first set to a data from the resampled second set (paragraphs 0023 and 0030). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Suresh et al. to include the method of assessing and comparing resampled data as taught by Ustuner et al. for the purpose of distinguishing between diseased tissue and healthy tissue.

Regarding claim 2, Suresh et al. disclose that as applied to claim 1. Suresh et al. further disclose comparing the third property of the region of the heart to a normal range for the region of the heart, wherein the normal range is assessed for a healthy heart (paragraphs 213 and 304).

Regarding claim 3, Suresh et al. disclose that as applied to claims 1 and 2. Suresh et al. further disclose the first property comprises wall motion (paragraph 303).

Claims 1-3 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.